

BOIES, SCHILLER & FLEXNER LLP
 RICHARD J. POCKER (NV Bar No. 3568)
 300 South Fourth Street, Suite 800
 Las Vegas, NV 89101
 Telephone: (702) 382-7300
 Facsimile: (702) 382-2755
 rpocker@bsfllp.com

BOIES, SCHILLER & FLEXNER LLP
 WILLIAM ISAACSON (*pro hac vice*)
 KAREN DUNN (*pro hac vice*)
 5301 Wisconsin Ave, NW
 Washington, DC 20015
 Telephone: (202) 237-2727
 Facsimile: (202) 237-6131
 wisaacson@bsfllp.com
 kdunn@bsfllp.com

BOIES, SCHILLER & FLEXNER LLP
 STEVEN C. HOLTZMAN (*pro hac vice*)
 KIERAN P. RINGGENBERG (*pro hac vice*)
 1999 Harrison Street, Suite 900
 Oakland, CA 94612
 Telephone: (510) 874-1000
 Facsimile: (510) 874-1460
 sholtzman@bsfllp.com
 kringgenberg@bsfllp.com

Attorneys for Plaintiffs Oracle USA, Inc.,
 Oracle America, Inc. and Oracle International
 Corp.

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
 THOMAS S. HIXSON (*pro hac vice*)
 KRISTEN A. PALUMBO (*pro hac vice*)
 One Market, Spear Street Tower
 San Francisco, CA 94105-1596
 Telephone: 415.442.1000
 Facsimile: 415.442.1001
 thomas.hixson@bingham.com
 kristen.palumbo@bingham.com

DORIAN DALEY (*pro hac vice*)
 DEBORAH K. MILLER (*pro hac vice*)
 JAMES C. MAROULIS (*pro hac vice*)
 ORACLE CORPORATION
 500 Oracle Parkway, M/S 5op7
 Redwood City, CA 94070
 Telephone: 650.506.4846
 Facsimile: 650.506.7114
 dorian.daley@oracle.com
 deborah.miller@oracle.com
 jim.maroulis@oracle.com

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

DISTRICT OF NEVADA

ORACLE USA, INC., a Colorado corporation;
 ORACLE AMERICA, INC., a Delaware
 corporation; and ORACLE INTERNATIONAL
 CORPORATION, a California corporation,

Plaintiffs,

v.

RIMINI STREET, INC., a Nevada corporation;
 SETH RAVIN, an individual,

Defendants.

Case No 2:10-cv-0106-LRH-PAL

**ORACLE'S MOTION TO SEAL
 RESPONSE TO RIMINI'S
 OBJECTIONS TO EVIDENCE
 SUBMITTED WITH ORACLE'S
 REPLY BRIEF**

Pursuant to the Stipulated Protective Order governing confidentiality of documents entered by the Court on May 21, 2010, Dkt. 55 (“Protective Order”), and Rules 5.2 and 26(c) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Plaintiffs Oracle USA, Inc., Oracle America, Inc., and Oracle International Corporation (collectively “Oracle”) respectfully request that the Court order the Clerk of the Court to file under seal certain portions of Oracle’s Response to Defendant Rimini Street, Inc.’s and Seth Ravin’s Objections to Evidence Submitted with Oracle’s Reply Brief (“Oracle’s Response”). These portions of Oracle’s Response reflect information that Rimini Street, Inc. (“Rimini”) likely intended or intends to have designated “Confidential Information” or “Highly Confidential - Attorneys’ Eyes Only” under the Protective Order. A public, redacted version of Oracle’s Response, *see* Dkt. 1032, and an unredacted version was subsequently filed under seal with the Court, *see* Dkts. 1033.

The Protective Order states, “Counsel for any Designating Party may designate any Discovery Material as ‘Confidential Information’ or ‘Highly Confidential Information – Attorneys’ Eyes Only’ under the terms of this Protective Order *only if such counsel in good faith believes that such Discovery Material contains such information and is subject to protection under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(c)*. The designation by any Designating Party of any Discovery Material as ‘Confidential Information’ or ‘Highly Confidential Information – Attorneys’ Eyes Only’ shall constitute a representation that an attorney for the Designating Party reasonably believes there is a valid basis for such designation.” Protective Order ¶ 2 (emphasis supplied).

RIMINI DOCUMENTS

In an abundance of caution, Oracle believes that Rimini intended or intends the following document have a confidentiality designation under the Protective Order:

Ex.	Description	Designation
Dkt. 1024, Ex. E	DTX 3023	Oracle believes that Rimini intended this document be designated Highly Confidential

1 Oracle previously filed this document under seal, and portions of Oracle's Response
2 quote from this document. Thus, Oracle submits Oracle's Response under seal pursuant to the
3 Protective Order based on its belief that Rimini believes there is a valid basis under the
4 Protective Order for a confidentiality designation of this material. Because the materials are
5 Rimini's, Oracle is not in a position to provide further justification for why filing them publicly
6 would cause Rimini harm sufficient to show good cause.

7 Oracle has submitted all other portions of Oracle's Response to the Court's public files,
8 which allow public access to all materials except for the items discussed above. Accordingly,
9 the request to seal is narrowly tailored. For the foregoing reasons, Oracle respectfully requests
10 that the Court grant leave to file under seal the documents discussed above.

11
12 DATED: May 5, 2016

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

13 By: /s/ Thomas S. Hixson
14 Thomas S. Hixson
15 Attorneys for Plaintiffs
16 Oracle USA, Inc.,
Oracle America, Inc.,
and Oracle International Corp.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that on May 5, 2016, I electronically transmitted the foregoing **ORACLE'S MOTION TO SEAL RESPONSE TO RIMINI'S OBJECTIONS TO EVIDENCE SUBMITTED WITH ORACLE'S REPLY BRIEF** to the Clerk's Office using the Electronic Filing System pursuant to Special Order No. 109.

Dated: May 5, 2016

Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP

By: /s/ Thomas Hixson
Thomas Hixson

Attorneys for Plaintiffs
Oracle USA, Inc.,
Oracle America, Inc. and
Oracle International Corporation